

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request that the above-identified application be reexamined.

Claims 1-16 are pending in this application. The Office Action mailed November 15, 2007 (hereinafter "Office Action"), rejected Claims 1-5, 8-13, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,107,548, issued to Shafron (hereinafter "Shafron"). Claims 6, 7, 14, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of the teachings of Shafron taken in view of the teachings of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0196279, to Bloomfield et al. (hereinafter Bloomfield et al.). Applicants respectfully disagree for the reasons set forth below.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 and for the reasons set forth below, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims. Prior to discussing in detail why applicants believe that all the claims in this application are allowable, a brief description of the disclosed subject matter and brief descriptions of the teachings of the cited and applied references are provided. The following descriptions of the disclosed subject matter and the cited and applied references are not provided to define the scope or interpretation of any of the claims of this application. Instead, these descriptions are provided solely to assist the United States Patent and Trademark Office in recognizing the differences between the pending claims and the cited references, and should not be construed as limiting on the disclosed subject matter.

Disclosed Subject Matter

A method of allowing users of a computer-implemented application program running on a data processing system to manage add-ons associated with the application program is disclosed. As noted in the specification, add-ons comprise small software programs pluggable into an application program for adding functionality to the application program. The method comprises generating a user interface that identifies add-ons associated with the application program in response to user input for managing the enable/disable state of the add-ons. In response to user input, the enable/disable state of the add-ons is managed by determining if the

user has selected a list of add-ons. If the user has selected a list of add-ons, the method comprises determining if the user has selected a particular add-on from the list. If the user has selected a particular add-on from the list, the method includes determining if the user has chosen to disable or enable the particular add-on. If the user has chosen to disable the particular add-on, the add-on is disabled. If the user has chosen to enable the add-on, the add-on is enabled. Also disclosed is computer readable storage media containing computer executable instructions that, when executed in a data processing device, allow the users of an application program to manage add-ons associated with the application program in accordance with the foregoing method.

As will be readily appreciated from the foregoing description, the disclosed method allows a user of an application program to observe add-ons associated with the application program. The method also allows a user to enable or disable add-ons. The disclosed method also allows a user to update certain add-ons, such as ActiveX[®] controls. The disclosed method also allows an administrator of an application program to approve or block particular add-ons for an application program. An administrator can also restrict a user's ability to disable or enable add-ons. The stability of an application program that supports add-ons is improved by allowing a user to easily disable a problematic add-on.

Summary of Shafron (U.S. Patent No. 7,107,548)

Shafron purportedly discloses a method of dynamically controlling and displaying an Internet browser interface and a dynamically controllable Internet browser interface. Shafron's browser interface can be customized using a controlling software program that may be provided by an Internet content provider or an ISP, or that may reside on an Internet user's computer. The controlling software program enables the Internet user, the content provider, or the ISP to customize and control the information and/or functionality of a user's browser and browser interface. While describing a dynamically controllable browser interface, Shafron fails to teach, disclose, or suggest managing add-ons through a user interface generated for that purpose.

Summary of Bloomfield et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0196279)

Bloomfield et al. purportedly discloses the display of application-output data within application-output windows embedded in a web browser window. The application-output windows can be dynamically moved, resized, and otherwise manipulated within the web browser window even when the application program providing the source of the application-output data is non-web enabled (e.g., legacy applications). Bloomfield et al. receives window attribute information associated with the application-output windows via a first virtual channel and displays application-output data received via a second virtual channel within the application-output windows, which are formed and/or modified using the window attribute information.

Rejection of Claims 1-5, 8-13, and 16 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

As indicated above, Claims 1-5, 8-13, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Shafron.

Claims 1-5 and 8

Remarks accompanying the rejection of independent Claim 1 in the Office Action state:

Re claim 1, Shafron discloses a method comprising:

- (a) generating a user interface that identifies add-ons associated with an application program and responds to user input for managing the enable/disable state of said add-ons (controllable user interface with information or functionality using controlling software program, see abstract for example), the add-ons comprising small software programs pluggable into the application program for adding functionality to the application program (controllable user interface with information or functionality using controlling software program for example); and
- (b) in response to user input, managing the enable/disable state of said add-ons (controlling using the controlling software program, see abstract for example) by:
 - (i) determining if the user has selected a list of add-ons (see column 2 lines 38-42 and abstract for example);
 - (ii) if the user has selected a list of add-ons, determining if the user has selected a particular add-on from the list (see column 3 lines 8-10 for example);
 - (iii) if the user has selected a particular add-on from the list, determining if the user has chosen to disable or enable the particular add-on (updates and recontacts the section of add-on unless disabled or

closed, see abstract, column 2 lines 23-25 and column 16 lines 12-17 for example);

(iv) if the user has chosen to disable the particular add-on, disabling the add-on (see column 16 lines 12-17 for example) and

(v) if the user has chosen to enable the add-on, enabling the add-on (see column 3 lines 8-10 for example).

Claim 1 reads as follows:

1. A method of allowing users of a computer-implemented application program running on a data processing system to manage add-ons associated with the application program, comprising:

(a) generating a user interface that identifies add-ons associated with an application program and responds to user input for managing the enable/disable state of said add-ons, the add-ons comprising small software programs pluggable into the application program for adding functionality to the application program; and

(b) in response to user input, managing the enable/disable state of said add-ons by:

(i) determining if the user has selected a list of add-ons;

(ii) if the user has selected a list of add-ons, determining if the user has selected a particular add-on from the list;

(iii) if the user has selected a particular add-on from the list, determining if the user has chosen to disable or enable the particular add-on;

(iv) if the user has chosen to disable the particular add-on, disabling the add-on; and

(v) if the user has chosen to enable the add-on, enabling the add-on.

Applicants respectfully disagree that Claim 1 is anticipated by Shafron. Before addressing the rejection of Claim 1 in detail, applicants note that Shafron, while disclosing a controlling program that creates a library file that includes an ActiveX control or Plug-in code that defines an interface object and that, when open, adds the functionality provided by ActiveX control or Plug-in code to the browser interface, fails to teach, disclose, or suggest managing add-ons through a user interface generated for that purpose as recited in Claim 1 (see, e.g., Shafron, Col. 7, lines 62-67, Col. 8, lines 34-58). Instead, Shafron describes alternative ways of controlling a browser interface through manipulating (e.g., subclassing, hiding, or disabling) the browser interface windows (see, e.g., Col. 15, lines 14-55; Col. 18, lines 31-59), as well as ways

of ensuring that the library file remains open as long as the browser is activated (see, e.g., Col. 4, lines 40-43; Col. 9, lines 45-64). Because Shafron does not disclose, teach, or suggest a method of allowing users of a computer-implemented application program to manage add-ons associated with the application program using the user interface specially generated for this purpose, Shafron is not directed to the subject matter recited in the preamble of Claim 1.

Applicants disagree that clause (a) of Claim 1 is anticipated by the abstract of Shafron, as the Office Action asserts. Nowhere in the abstract does Shafron disclose, teach, or suggest "generating a user interface that identifies add-ons associated with an application program and responds to user input for managing the enable/disable state of said add-ons," as recited in clause (a) of Claim 1. All the abstract of Shafron provides is a general description of "a browser interface that may be customized using a controlling software program." None of the specific details of such customization are described. There is no description of a user interface that identifies add-ons associated with an application or responds to user input for managing the enable/disable state of add-ons.

Applicants further disagree that clause (b) of Claim 1 is anticipated by Shafron. With regard to clause (b)(i), the Office Action references Col. 2, lines 38-42, and the abstract of Shafron. However, the referenced text fails to describe, teach, or suggest "in response to user input, managing the enable/disable state of said add-ons by determining if the user has selected a list of add-ons." Instead, the referenced text describes that "the second parent and its dependent windows may provide, for example, various information (e.g., advertisements, coupons, news, HTML links, etc.) and functionality (i.e., toolbars, pull-down menus, Plug-ins, applications, etc.) to the Internet user." Thus, the specific determination "if the user has selected a list of add-ons" is not disclosed or suggested in the referenced paragraph.

Similarly, the text referenced in the Office Action in regard to Claim 1, clauses (b)(ii)-(b)(v), fails to describe, teach, or suggest the specific functions recited in these clauses. For example, Col. 3, lines 8-10, of Shafron, referenced in regard to clause (b)(ii), fail to

disclose, teach, or suggest "determining if the user has selected a particular add-on from the list," describing instead in general terms that the user may customize the browser interface so that each time the user accesses the Internet, user-defined information will be displayed with the browser interface.

The Office Action references the same Shafron location in regard to clause (b)(v), which recites "if the user has chosen to enable the add-on, enabling the add-on." Clearly, Shafron fails to teach or suggest clause (b)(v) of Claim 1 as the identified location.

Further, Col. 2, lines 23-25, and Col. 16, lines 12-17, of Shafron referenced in the Office Action fail to teach or suggest the (b)(iii) clause of Claim 1, which recites "if the user has selected a particular add-on from the list, determining if the user has chosen to disable or enable the particular add-on." In contrast, the referenced text states only that a browser is capable of loading a plug-in via an Internet site (Col. 2, lines 23-25) and describes creating the Function Window that represents the original browser interface within which the functionality of the Plug-ins was initially loaded (Col. 16, lines 12-17; see also Col. 14, line 67-Col. 15, line 2).

Col. 16, lines 12-17 of Shafron are also referenced in the Office Action in regard to clause (b)(iv) of Claim 1, but the referenced text clearly fails to disclose or suggest the "disabling the add-on" element of clause (b)(iv).

Applicants note that 37 C.F.R. § 1.104(c)(2), under the "Rejection of Claims" heading, requires:

When a reference is complex or shows or describes inventions other than that claimed by the applicant, the particular part relied on must be designated as nearly as practicable. The pertinence of each reference, if not apparent, must be clearly explained and each rejected claim specified.

Applicants respectfully submit that the remarks in the Office Action fail to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.104(c)(2) quoted above because the remarks fail to show the pertinence of the reference portions of Shafron in regard to the recitations of Claim 1. In the absence of such a showing, applicants submit that Claim 1 and the claims which depend therefrom rejected as being anticipated by Shafron (Claims 2-5 and 8) are clearly allowable in view of Shafron.

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100

Claims 9-13 and 16

Because independent Claim 9 recites a computer-readable storage medium containing computer-executable instructions that, when executed in a data processing device, allow the users of an application program to manage add-ons associated with the application program using the method of Claim 1, and because the rejection of Claim 9 is based on the rationale and the reference recited in the Office Action rejection of Claim 1, i.e., Shafron, Claim 9 is respectfully submitted to be allowable for the same reasons as Claim 1, based on the rationale provided in the above discussion of Claim 1. Claims 10-13 and 16 depend from Claim 9 and are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 9 is submitted to be allowable.

Rejection of Claims 6, 7, 14, and 15 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)


As indicated above, Claims 6, 7, 14, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of the teachings of Shafron taken in view of the teachings of Bloomfield et al. Because Bloomfield et al. does not make up for the deficiencies of Shafron as discussed above regarding Claims 1 and 9, and because Claims 6 and 7 depend from Claim 1, and Claims 14 and 15 depend from Claim 9, Claims 6, 7, 14, and 15 are submitted to be allowable for the same reasons as Claims 1 and 9.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims in this application are allowable, and request early and favorable action passing this application to issue. If the Examiner has any remaining questions, the Examiner is encouraged to contact applicants' attorney at the number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR
JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLC}



Gary S. Kindness
Registration No. 22,178
Direct Dial No. 206.695.1702

GSK/VXR:tmm

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100